

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action dated June 23, 2004, claims 1 – 20 were rejected although claims 7 and 18 were deemed to be allowable if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8 and canceled claims 7 and 18 and hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter Claims 1 and 8

As noted in the Office action on page 14, item 18, dependent claims 7 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the noted allowable subject matter, independent claims 1 and 8 are amended to include all of the limitations of claims 7 and 18, respectively. The claim amendments add the polarization rotator from claims 7 and 18 to the systems of claims 1 and 8, respectively, in a location which is between the planar waveguide optical coupler and the polarizing beam splitter. Specifically, claims 1 and 18 are amended to include “a polarization rotator directly adjacent to said first output of said planar waveguide optical coupler.” The language related to the polarizing beam splitter is also amended to recite that the polarizing beam splitter is directly adjacent to the newly added polarization rotator instead of the planar waveguide optical coupler. An additional phrase is also added to specify that the “polarization rotator is located between said planar waveguide optical coupler and said polarizing beam splitter.”

The systems recited in amended claims 1 and 8 are clearly depicted in Fig. 7 of the Applicants' specification. As depicted in Fig. 7, the polarization rotator (772) is located between the planar waveguide optical coupler (770) and the polarizing beam splitter (724). This configuration is also described on page 14, lines 5 – 7 of the Applicants' specification. Applicants assert that claims 1 and 8, as amended, meet all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

In view of the amendments made to claims 1 and 8, Applicants assert that these claims are in an allowable condition.

8

II. Dependent claims 2 – 6, 9 – 17, 19, and 20

Claims 2 – 6 depend from independent claim 1 and should be allowed based on an allowable claim 1.

Claims 9 – 17, 19, and 20 depend from independent claim 8 and should be allowed based on an allowable claim 8.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 27, 2004

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111